Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/705,668	BOGGS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Aimee J Li	. 2183
All Participants:	Status of Applicatio	n: <u>Respons to Non-Final</u>
(1) <u>Aimee J Li</u> .	(3)	
(2) Joseph Lutz (Reg. No. 43,765).	(4)	
Date of Interview: <u>17 November 2004</u>	Time: <u>2:30pm</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ Yes, provide a brief description:	Applicant's representative) No	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: Double Patenting Rejection		
Claims discussed:		
Prior art documents discussed: N/A		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE See Continuation Sheet	GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT	Γ WAS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a se directly resulted in the allowance of the applicat of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a se did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief section of all issues. 	tion. The examiner will provide a	written summary of the substance of the interview. since the interview
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (A	pplicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner contacted Applicants's representative regarding filing a Terminal Disclaimer to overcome the obviousness Double Patenting Rejection and making an Examiner's Amendment to claim 19. Claim 19 currently states "dispatching one of the plurality of instructions to an execution unit to be executed either when a counter for the instruction does not exceed a maximum number of replays..." with no other limitation clearly stating what the counter is counting. The other Independent claims 1 and 13 have a limitation stating "to increment a counter for each of the plurality of instructions to reflect the number of times each of the plurality of instructions has been executed", which clearly reflects what the counter is counting. The Examiner would like a similar limitation to be added to claim 19 to clarify what the counter is counting.